

**U. S. Department of Energy
Facilities Information Management System
Request for Change
Change Request #: 17-14**

Requestor Name:	Deborah Couchman-Griswold	Date:	April 12, 2017	Affiliation:	
Email Address:	Deborah.couchman-griswold@nnsa.doe.gov	Phone No:	505-845-4752	DOE	X
Program Office:	NNSA/NA-521			Contractor	
Proposed Change:	<p>Modify the descriptions for the following fields as described:</p> <p>Mission Impact Refer to the Retention Impact Guide in attachment B of the Laboratory and Operations' Guidance for Evaluating DOE's Excess Facilities. This is an adjectival picklist that provides insight into <u>potential impacts</u> concerns the site/lab has if the asset were to remain. Based on current known mission requirements, select the most appropriate response. Sites/labs should Consider potential impacts to the-missions of other programs that may be located at the site/lab or within the vicinity of <u>the</u> facility. The choices for the picklist are <u>a number from 1 through 4 with the following meanings as defined in the Assessment Guide for Prioritization in attachment B of the Guidance for Evaluating DOE's Excess Facilities (March 13, 2017).</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No Impact. Retention of the facility has no impact on Site mission. 2. Minor Impact. - Retention of the facility has minor impact on Site mission. Mission can be achieved with minor adjustments to scientific/programmatic schedule and cost operations. 3. <u>Moderate</u> Impact. Retention of the facility has major impact on Site mission. Mission can be achieved with some adjustments to schedules and operational costs. 4. Significant Impact. Retention of the facility has significant impact and is preventing or will prevent the achievement/progress of Site mission goals. <p>Public Health & Environmental Stewardship Refer to the Retention Impact Guide in attachment B of the Laboratory and Operations' Guidance for Evaluating DOE's Excess Facilities. This is an adjectival picklist that provides insight into <u>potential impacts</u> concerns the site/lab has if the asset were to remain. Based on current known mission requirements and receptors, select the most appropriate response. Sites/labs should Consider potential impacts to other tenants and programs that may be located at the site/lab or within the vicinity of <u>the</u> facility. The choices for the picklist are <u>a number from 1 through 4 with the following meanings as defined in the Assessment Guide for Prioritization in attachment B of the Guidance for Evaluating DOE's Excess Facilities (March 13, 2017).</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No Impact. The facility and its contents are not expected to pose radiological, chemical, or hazardous material release to the environment. Compliant with all environmental requirements. 2. Minor Impact. If not actively managed, the facility and its contents could present minor radiological, chemical, or hazardous material release that could impact local employee health. Possibility of occasional minor deviation of environmental compliance requirements. 3. <u>Moderate</u> Impact. If not actively managed, the facility and its contents could present a radiological, chemical, or hazardous material release that could impact site employees and visitors, along with local employee health. Possibility of frequent minor violations of environmental compliance requirements. 				

**U. S. Department of Energy
Facilities Information Management System
Request for Change
Change Request #: 17-14**

	<p>4. Significant Impact. If not actively managed, the facility and its contents could present a radiological, chemical, or hazardous material release that could impact off-site public, site employees and visitors, along with local employee health. Possibility of serious frequent violations of environmental compliance requirements.</p> <p>Safety Refer to the Retention Impact Guide in attachment B of the Laboratory and Operations' Guidance for Evaluating DOE's Excess Facilities. This is an adjectival picklist that provides insight into <u>potential impacts</u> concerns the site/lab has if the asset were to remain. Based on current known mission requirements and operations, select the most appropriate response. Sites/labs should Consider potential impacts to other tenants and programs that may be located at the site/lab or within the vicinity of a facility. The choices for the picklist are <u>a number from 1 through 4 with the following meanings as defined in the Assessment Guide for Prioritization in attachment B of the Guidance for Evaluating DOE's Excess Facilities (March 13, 2017):</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No Impact. Facility condition poses no safety concerns to Site employees. 2. Minor Impact. Facility condition poses minor safety concerns to Site employees due to deterioration/deferred maintenance. 3. <u>Moderate</u> Impact. – Facility condition poses moderate safety concerns to Site employees due to deterioration/deferred maintenance. 4. Significant Impact. Facility condition poses significant safety concerns or is unsafe for any access as a result of deterioration/deferred maintenance.
Justification:	<p>The changes align the descriptions of the FIMS fields with the 2017 <i>Assessment Guide for Prioritization in attachment B of the Guidance for Evaluating DOE's Excess Facilities</i> approved by the Excess Contaminated Facilities Working Group OB in March 2017.</p>
Please Do Not Type Below This Line	
FAC Remarks:	06/14/2017 – FAC Recommended
OAM Remarks:	
FDDC Remarks:	06/26/2017 – FDDC Approved
Implemented:	01/04/2018 – Implemented into FIMS v3.4